REMARKS

This amendment and related remarks that follow are intended to place the subject application in condition for allowance. Amendments to the claims are presented starting on page 2. No new matter is introduced as a result of these claim amendments. In view of these amendments and the following reasoning for allowance, the Applicant hereby respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the subject application.

1.   **Rejection of Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11 and 20 under 35 USC §103(a)**

In the Office Action of January 27, 2006, claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over **Lee**, Pub. No. US 2002/0087521 A1, in view of Thorner et al., US Patent No. 6,463,443 (hereinafter **Thorner**). Claim 1 has been amended to overcome these rejections.

In particular, claim 1, as amended now recites elements of a system which automatically interfaces "with **display rendering routines of a computing device to recover electronic information** being displayed on a display device coupled to the computing device." This **recovered information is then interpreted and parsed** "to identify data representing any person."

This issue was partially addressed by the Office Action in rejecting claim 24 with respect to the **Lee** reference, wherein the Office Action suggests that Lee teaches the claimed element of "automatically scanning electronic **data being rendered on the computer display device** to identify information within the electronic data that represents at least one person" (emphasis added). The Office Action offers page 1, paragraphs [0005] through [0020], and page 2, paragraphs [0032] to [0033] in support of this argument.

However, the cited paragraphs of the **Lee** reference (page 1, paragraphs [0005] through [0020], and page 2, paragraphs [0032] to [0033]) specifically recite various

methods for scanning or parsing *text documents and similar files*. For example, on page 1, paragraph [0016], *Lee* explains:

> "The electronic file may be for example a text file (such as a .txt file) or an html file. In the later case, and for similarly structured files, the file may be pre-processed to remove mark-up tags."

Clearly, *Lee* is directly parsing electronic files, and is *not* describing or suggesting any capability to recover information being displayed on a display device by interfacing with the display rendering routines of a computing device. Further,

In contrast, the applicant is claiming a system that does not scan or parse electronic documents directly, but instead provides a system for "*interfacing with display rendering routines of a computing device to recover electronic information being displayed on a display device* coupled to the computing device; and "automatically *interpreting and parsing the recovered electronic information* to identify data representing any person…"

In view of the detailed description provided in the Applicant's specification, it should be clear that this is *not* interpreted to mean that a document is first scanned and then rendered on the display device, but rather, that the **Applicant's claimed system is directly scanning the information being rendered on the display device itself** to identify data representing any person. This embodiment is particularly useful when a document's electronic file is not directly available to a computing device for parsing, or user access or privileges to that information may be restricted for some reason.

For example, in paragraph [0068] of the Applicant's specification, the Applicant discloses interfacing with the display rendering routines of a computing device for parsing information viewable to the user in addition to information that may be hidden from the user. In particular, paragraph [0068] of the specification states:

"This working example ***automatically interfaces with display rendering
routines of a computer system***. The display screen of a computer is
rendered in response to instructions, i.e., the display input, such as, for
example compiled software code, such as a typical computer program, or,
interpreted page descriptions such as HTML or similar script. Consequently,
this working example essentially parses all information viewable by the user,
as well as hidden text or instructions, such as, for example, hidden text
embedded in the HTML code of an Internet web page, to find persons.
Specifically, the working example is capable of scanning the display input
looking for known names, email addresses (using the canonical form of
XXX@YYY.ZZZ), phone numbers, etc., or any data that may represent a
person, as described above." (emphasis added)

Consequently, based on the arguments presented above, neither ***Lee*** nor ***Thorner***
teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically alerting a user to available
information. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in
accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of
obviousness means that rejected claims 1, 4-6, 9, 11 and 20 are patentable under 35 USC
§103(a) over ***Lee*** in view of ***Thorner***. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests
reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1, and thus the rejection of dependent claims 4-6,
9, 11, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over ***Lee*** in view of ***Thorner***, in view of the non-
obviousness of claim 1, as cited below:

"A system for automatically alerting a user to available information
comprising using a computing device for:
***interfacing with display rendering routines of a computing device
to recover electronic information*** being displayed on a display device
coupled to the computing device;
***automatically interpreting and parsing the recovered electronic
information to identify data representing any person***;
identifying at least one person represented by the identified data;

automatically retrieving information relating to each identified person from at least one electronic database;

notifying the user that the retrieved information is available; and

using at least a portion of the retrieved information relating to one or more of the identified persons to automatically provide at least one electronic interface for initiating communication with those identified persons."

(emphasis added)

2.   Rejection of Claims 24, 25, 35 and 36 Under 35 USC §103(a)

In the Office Action of January 27, 2006, claims 24, 25, 35 and 36 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over **Lee**, Pub. No. US 2002/0087521 A1, in view of Thorner et al., US Patent No. 6,463,443 (hereinafter **Thorner**). The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections in view of the following arguments for patentability.

In particular, with respect to the **Lee** reference, the Office Action suggests that **Lee** teaches the claimed element of "automatically scanning electronic **data being rendered on the computer display device** to identify information within the electronic data that represents at least one person" (emphasis added).

However, as explained by the Applicant in several prior responses, Applicant understands this element to mean that the claimed invention should **not** by interpreted to mean that a document is first scanned and then rendered on the display device, but rather, that the **Applicant's claimed system is directly scanning the information being rendered on the display device itself** to identify data representing any person. This embodiment is particularly useful when a document's electronic file is not directly available to a computing device for parsing. However, for purposes of clarity, Applicant has further amended claim 24 to clarify this point by reciting the following elements:

> "*automatically interfacing with the <u>display rendering routines</u> of a display device of a computer to <u>retrieve a copy of electronic data being rendered on the computer display</u> device*;
>
> *automatically interpreting and scanning the retrieved electronic data being rendered on the computer display* device to identify information within the retrieved electronic data that represents at least one person"

In suggesting that the *Lee* reference teaches "automatically scanning electronic *data being rendered on the computer display device*," the Office Action offers page 1, paragraphs [0005] through [0020], and page 2, paragraphs [0032] to [0033] of *Lee*. However, these cited paragraphs of the *Lee* reference specifically recite various methods for scanning or parsing *text documents and similar files*. For example, on page 1, paragraph [0016], *Lee* explains:

> "The electronic file may be for example a text file (such as a .txt file) or an html file. In the later case, and for similarly structured files, the file may be pre-processed to remove mark-up tags."

Clearly, the Office Action has incorrectly characterized the alleged ability of the Lee reference to **scan electronic data <u>being rendered</u> on a computer display device**.

In particular, as previously explained by the Applicant, the **Applicant claims a system for automatically scanning electronic <u>data being rendered on a computer display device</u>**. In view of the detailed description provided in the Applicant's specification, it should be clear that this is *not* interpreted to mean that a document is first scanned and then rendered on the display device, but rather, that the **Applicant's claimed system is directly scanning the information being rendered on the display device itself** to identify data representing any person. This embodiment is particularly useful when a document's electronic file is not directly available to a computing device for parsing.

For example, in paragraph [0068] of the Applicant's specification, the Applicant discloses interfacing with the display rendering routines of a computing device for parsing information viewable to the user in addition to information that may be hidden from the user. In particular, paragraph [0068] of the specification states:

> "This working example automatically interfaces with display rendering routines of a computer system. The display screen of a computer is rendered in response to instructions, i.e., the display input, such as, for example compiled software code, such as a typical computer program, or, interpreted page descriptions such as HTML or similar script. Consequently, this working example essentially parses all information viewable by the user, as well as hidden text or instructions, such as, for example, hidden text embedded in the HTML code of an Internet web page, to find persons. Specifically, the working example is capable of scanning the display input looking for known names, email addresses (using the canonical form of XXX@YYY.ZZZ), phone numbers, etc., or any data that may represent a person, as described above."

Further, it should be noted that the present Office Action failed to respond to the Applicants prior arguments regarding "***automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on the computer display device to identify information***…" In particular, the issue regarding scanning data being rendered on a display device was raised in Applicant's previous Office Action response dated July 20, 2005, but it was not addressed in the subsequent Office Action. Further, this issue was again raised in the Applicant's previous Office Action response entered on October 31, 2005, but it was not addressed by the current Office Action. In addition, this issue was again raised in the Applicant's previous Office Action response entered on March 27, 2006, but was not addressed in the Advisory Action issued in this case. Consequently, since no Office Action or other communication has responded in any way to the substance of the Applicants remarks and arguments regarding this issue, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of any claims including this element are unsupported by the cited references.

Consequently, based on the arguments presented above, neither Lee nor Thorner teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for *automatically scanning electronic data being <u>rendered on a computer display device</u>*. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 24, 25, 35 and 36 are patentable under 35 USC §103(a) over Lee in view of Thorner. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 24, and thus the rejection of dependent claims 25, 35 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Lee* in view of *Thorner*, in view of the non-obviousness of claim 24, as cited below:

> "A computer-implemented process for automatically providing information on a computer display device, comprising:
>
> > *automatically interfacing with the <u>display rendering routines</u> of a display device of a computer to <u>retrieve a copy of electronic data being rendered on the computer display</u> device*;
> >
> > *automatically interpreting and scanning the retrieved electronic data being rendered on the computer display* device to identify information within the retrieved electronic data that represents at least one person;
> >
> > identifying each person represented by the identified information;
> >
> > automatically retrieving information relating to each identified person from at least one electronic database;
> >
> > providing an alert for indicating that the retrieved information is available; and
> >
> > using at least a portion of the retrieved information relating to one or more of the identified persons to automatically provide a user interface for initiating communication with those identified persons via at least one electronic communication access point." (emphasis added)

3.   **Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of Srinivasan, US Patent No. 6,717,936. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 1, as discussed above in Section 1.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Sections 1 and 2 above and the Examiner's statements regarding *Srinivasan*, neither *Lee, Thorner* nor *Srinivasan*, nor any combination thereof, teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from *interpreting and parsing information recovered from a display device by interfacing with the display rendering routines of the computing device*. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claim 2 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of *Srinivasan*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this claim be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

4.   **Rejection of Claims 7 and 8 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 7 and 8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of Dimitrova, US Patent No. 6,363,380. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 1, as discussed above in Section 1.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding *Dimitrova*, neither *Lee, Thorner* nor *Dimitrova* teach

the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from *interpreting and parsing information recovered from a display device by interfacing with the display rendering routines of the computing device*. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 7 and 8 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of *Dimitrova*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

5.   **Rejection of Claims 10 and 12 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 10 and 12 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of Sorensen, US Patent No. 6,628,729. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 1, as discussed above in Section 1.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding *Sorensen*, neither *Lee*, *Thorner* nor *Sorensen* teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from *interpreting and parsing information recovered from a display device by interfacing with the display rendering routines of the computing device*. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 10 and 12 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of *Sorensen*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

6. **Rejection of Claims 13-15 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 13-15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of Yamakita, US Patent No. 6,272,490. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 1, as discussed above in Section 1.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding *Yamakita*, neither *Lee*, *Thorner* nor *Yamakita* teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from *interpreting and parsing information recovered from a display device by interfacing with the display rendering routines of the computing device*. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 13-15 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of *Yamakita*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

7. **Rejection of Claims 26-30 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 26-30 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Yamakita, US Patent No. 6,272,490. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 24, as discussed above in Section 2.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Sections 1 and 2 above and the Examiner's statements regarding *Yamakita*, neither *Lee*, *Thorner* nor *Yamakita* teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for automatically scanning electronic

data being rendered on a computer display device by *automatically interfacing with the display rendering routines of a display device of a computer to retrieve a copy of electronic data being rendered on the computer display device*, and then *interpreting and scanning the retrieved electronic data* to identify information that represents at least one person. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 26-30 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* and further in view of *Yamakita*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 24 and recited in Section 2 above.

8.   **Rejection of Claims 37, 38, 40-45 and 50 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected claims 37, 38, 40-45 and 50 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lee in view of Thorner and further in view of Yamakita, US Patent No. 6,272,490. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

In particular, similar to the discussion in Sections 1 and 2 above, **Lee teaches methods for parsing only electronic files. Lee does not teach methods for parsing or detecting any information in an electronic document *rendered on a computer display device*** (as claimed by the Applicant). This is reinforced by the *Lee* statement on page 1, paragraph [0016], as recited in Section 2 above.

In contrast, the Applicant claims a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically detecting any information in an electronic document ***rendered on a computer display device***. Specifically, Applicant claims computer executable instructions for "*automatically interfacing with display rendering routines of a computing device to recover electronic information corresponding to an electronic document being rendered on a display device coupled to the*

computing device…" The recovered electronic information is then evaluated to detect
"*any information in the electronic document that represents at least one person*…"

As discussed above, in view of the detailed description provided in the Applicant's
specification, it should be clear that this is *not* interpreted to mean that a document is first
scanned and then rendered on the display device, but rather, that the **Applicant's
claimed system is directly scanning the information being rendered on the display
device itself** to identify data representing any person. This embodiment is particularly
useful when a document's electronic file is not directly available to a computing device for
parsing, or user access or privileges to that information may be restricted for some reason.

In paragraph [0068] of the Applicant's specification, recited in Sections 1 and 2
above, the Applicant discloses interfacing with the display rendering routines of a
computing device for parsing information viewable to the user in addition to information
that may be hidden from the user.

In general, *Yamakita* teaches an apparatus whereby, for a designated electronic
document, for all "proper noun" words in the document, or for words that are not "general
ideas" and "appear frequently" in the document, a network search is performed for data
related to said words, an address links to said network data are added into the document
via a pointers to a link destination table, and the words are highlighted in the document.
**Nowhere in Yamakita is reference made to documents rendered on a computer
display device, or to methods or means for detecting the desired words in the
document on said device by interfacing with the display routines of the computing
device**.

Based on these arguments, neither *Lee*, *Thorner* nor *Yamakita* teach the
Applicant's claimed computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions
for automatically detecting information in an electronic document rendered on a computer
display device by interfacing with the display routines of a computing device to recover
electronic information corresponding to that electronic document. Accordingly, no prima

facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re

Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 37, 38,

40-45 and 50 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** and further

in view of **Yamakita**. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the

rejection of claim 37, and thus the rejection of dependent claims 38, 40-45 and 50 under

35 U.S.C. §103(a) over **Lee** in view of **Thorner**, and in further view of **Yamakita** in view of

the non-obviousness of claim 37, as cited below:

> A computer-readable medium having computer executable
> instructions for dynamically modifying an electronic document rendered on a
> computer display device, said computer executable instructions comprising:
> > ***automatically interfacing with display rendering routines of a
> > computing device to recover electronic information corresponding to
> > an electronic document being rendered on a display device coupled to
> > the computing device***;
> > ***automatically evaluating the electronic information
> > corresponding to the electronic document for detecting any information
> > in the electronic document that represents at least one person***;
> > automatically identifying each person based on a comparison of the
> > detected information to data in at least one electronic database;
> > automatically retrieving data related to each identified person from at
> > least one electronic database; and
> > dynamically modifying the rendered display of the electronic document
> > by changing the appearance of the electronic document on the display
> > device for alerting a user that data related to each identified person has been
> > retrieved." (emphasis added)

9.   <u>Rejection of Claim 39 Under 35 USC §103(a)</u>

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claim 39

under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** in view of **Yamakita**

and further in view of **Dimitrova**. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 37, as discussed above in Section 8.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Section 8 above and the Examiner's statements regarding **Dimitrova**, neither **Lee**, **Thorner**, **Yamakita** nor **Dimitrova** teach the Applicant's claimed computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically detecting information in an electronic document rendered on a computer display device. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claim 39 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** in view of **Yamakita** and further in view of **Dimitrova**. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this claim be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 37 and recited in Section 8 above.

10. **Rejection of Claims 16-19 and 21-23 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 16-19 and 21-23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** and further in view of Appelman et al., US Patent No. 6,539,421 (hereinafter **Appelman**). The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 1, as discussed above in Section 1.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Section 1 above and the Examiner's statements regarding **Appelman**, neither **Lee**, **Thorner** nor **Appelman** teach the Applicant's claimed system for automatically retrieving, from at least one electronic database, information relating to each identified person resulting from *interpreting and parsing information recovered from a display device by interfacing with the display rendering routines of the computing device*. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 16-19 and 21-23 are

patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** and further in view of **Appelman**. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 1 and recited in Section 1 above.

11.   **Rejection of Claims 31-34 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 31-34 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** and further in view of **Appelman** et al., US Patent No. 6,539,421. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 24, as discussed above in Section 2.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Section 2 above and the Examiner's statements regarding Appelman, neither **Lee**, **Thorner** nor **Appelman** teach the Applicant's claimed computer-implemented process for automatically scanning electronic data being rendered on a computer display device by _automatically interfacing with the display rendering routines of a display device of a computer to retrieve a copy of electronic data being rendered on the computer display device_, and then _interpreting and scanning the retrieved electronic data_ to identify information that represents at least one person. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 31-34 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** and further in view of **Appelman**. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 24 and recited in Section 2 above.

12.   **Rejection of Claims 46-49 Under 35 USC §103(a)**

The aforementioned Office Action of January 27, 2006 rejected dependent claims 46-49 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over **Lee** in view of **Thorner** in view of

Yamakita and further in view of *Appelman*. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection in view of the novelty of independent claim 37, as discussed above in Section 8.

In particular, based on the arguments presented in Section 8 above and the Examiner's statements regarding *Appelman*, neither *Lee*, *Thorner*, *Yamakita* nor *Appelman* teach the Applicant's claimed computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for automatically detecting information in an electronic document rendered on a computer display device. Accordingly, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established in accordance with the holding of In Re Fine. This lack of prima facie showing of obviousness means that rejected claims 46-49 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over *Lee* in view of *Thorner* in view of *Yamakita* and further in view of *Appelman*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be reconsidered based on the non-obvious claim language as exemplified in claim 37 and recited in section 8 above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 2 and 4-50 are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-50 and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (805) 278-8855 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Watson
_____

Lyon & Harr
300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 800
Oxnard, California 93036
(805) 278-8855

Mark A. Watson
Registration No. 41,370
Attorney for Applicant